

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are currently pending. Claims 1-38 were rejected. No claims have been amended.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bridgelall et al. (U.S. Patent 5,478,997).

The examiner has not shown Bridgelall to disclose or reasonably suggest an “electronic controller operative to automatically vary the power of the first beam inversely proportionally to the received energy” as recited by claim 1.

The applicant notes that the “variable pattern” referenced by Bridgelall at column 9, line 14+ (cited by the examiner) is apparently a variable scan path. Bridgelall’s pattern generator (Index 20 in Fig. 1) apparently controls the scan pattern, not beam power. Examples of Bridgelall’s variable scan patterns are shown, for example, in Figs. 9(a) - 16 of the reference. None of figures 1-3, 34 (cited by the examiner) appears to disclose all the limitations of claim 1. The applicant cannot find disclosure or reasonable suggestion in the cited portions of Bridgelall to varying the power of the beam inversely proportional to received energy. Claim 1 is allowable over Bridgelall for at least this reason.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and are also allowable for at least the reason given for claim 1.

The examiner has also not shown Bridgelall to disclose or reasonably suggest “a frame buffer operable to contain values for driving said variable illuminator” or “a leveling circuit operatively coupled to said detector and said frame buffer”, both of which are recited by claim 3. Figures 24 and 34 (cited by the examiner) do not appear to show a frame buffer, a leveling circuit, or an output to control beam power. Column 18 at lines 41+ (cited by the examiner) makes reference to a FIFO for receiving data from a frame grabber circuit but makes no mention of using the contents of the FIFO to drive a variable illuminator. Column 23 at lines 62+ (cited by the examiner) appears to describe a bar code decode (edge finding) circuit and does not appear to disclose the relevant limitations of claim 3. Claim 3 is additionally allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 3 and are also allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 3.

The examiner has not shown Bridgelall to disclose or reasonably suggest “the leveling circuit is operative to increase the output of said variable illuminator to locations that scatter relatively low amounts of energy” as recited by claim 4. The examiner has also not shown Bridgelall to disclose or reasonably suggest “said leveling circuit is operative to decrease the output of said variable illuminator to locations that scatter relatively high amounts of energy” as recited by claim 5. Bridgelall at column 23, line 62 to column 24, line 29 (cited by the examiner) appears to be discussing an aspect of a bar code decode (edge finding) circuit, not subject matter having to do with the relevant limitations of claims 4 or 5. Claims 4 and 5 are also allowable for at least this reason.

The examiner has not shown Bridgelall to disclose or reasonably suggest a “variable illuminator is responsive to a signal to modulate its output to produce substantially uniform detected energy across the field of view” nor that “the image in the field of view is substantially represented by the inverse of a frame buffer” as recited by claim 6. Bridgelall at column 23, line 62 to column 24, line 29 (cited by the examiner) appears to discuss aspects of a bar code decode circuit, not relevant limitations of claim 6. Claim 6 is also allowable for at least this reason.

Claims 7-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bridgelall et al. (U.S. Patent 5,478,997).

The examiner did not provide reasons for the rejection of claims 7-38. In the locations of Bridgelall cited by the examiner with reference to claims 1-6, the applicant cannot find Bridgelall to disclose or reasonably suggest all the limitations of any of claims 7-38. Accordingly, claims 7-38 are allowable over Bridgelall.


Applicant believes the listing of claims and remarks to be fully responsive to the Office Action dated July 1, 2005. It is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for issuance. Favorable consideration and a timely Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Application No. 10/630,062
Response Dated December 1, 2005
Reply to Office Action Dated July 1, 2005

The Examiner is invited to call Mr. Chris Wiklof at (425) 415-6641 with any issues that may advance prosecution of the application on the merits. Applicant submits that no new matter is being submitted.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0284.

Respectfully submitted,
Christopher A. Wiklof et al.



Christopher A. Wiklof
Registration No. 43,990

CAW:kje

Enclosures:

Postcard
Transmittal Form PTO/SB/21
Petition for Two-Month Extension of Time (+ copy)

Microvision, Inc.
19910 North Creek Parkway
Bothell, WA 98011
(425) 415-6847
(425) 415-6795 facsimile